

February 7, 1969

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

can life is an attempt to "be with them," or to be "integrated." This fear of total integration is an illusion. I've never yet met a black person who has been integrated into white society; he may think so, he may hope so, but it just ain't so. If any of us, at this point in time, believe such nonsense, we're suffering from a severe form of hallucination.

The inner-city must also avoid swallowing the hook thrown to the American Indian: "You'll be able to thrive and prosper on your very own reservation, surrounded by us." If we don't learn anything from history, we must relive the past. The time is over for asking or even demanding human rights, in or out of the theater. We no longer ask for manhood or womanhood or dignity; all we can do is express what we have to the degree that we have it. All whites aren't bad or good, the same goes for blacks—but this fact equalizes nothing. The whole racism mess is based upon the action of white supremacist deed and thought.

The theater must reflect, to some degree, that we live in a land where no white man has ever been executed for the murder of a black man, woman, or child, not one. A culture can be no better than the people from whom it springs. There are teachers who have taught for many years in segregated, black neighborhood schools and do not live in that area, or send their children to school there. And they oppose that rejected, hemmed-in community's gaining the power to create something constructive that will rescue children wounded by a century of white-supremacist "education." Their opposition is based upon the premise that self-determination will interfere with the seniority rights of adults who mainly live, work, play, and spend their money elsewhere. There is more drama off-stage than on, in American theater.

Kennedy, King, Kennedy . . . murdered, buried with ceremony, followed by discreet, uncomfortable silence; the message reaches us and we adjust our lives quietly or noisily. There is almost as much injustice in the theater as there is in the rest of the land, but there's no need of begging. Cope! Cope anyhow, anywhere you can, to the best of your ability. When opposed, we must bear in mind that a slave is a human being who lost a battle some place and has to find his way out of the bind. Also remember that whites who are proven brothers, like John Brown, are called "nigger-lovers" or madmen. In the past 40 years only 18 plays by black writers have been presented on Broadway. Soon we may have to read our works on the sidewalks of inner-city and "mainstream" Broadway. Time is up. I've a plan to write that may never be seen by any audience anywhere, but I do my thing. Who has ears to hear, hear . . . all others, later.

## A CHILDISH ATTACK ON THE ROTC

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI  
OF ILLINOISIN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I need not observe that the Chicago Tribune has a very spirited and solid editorial philosophy. I thought that the editorial commentary in its issue of Tuesday, February 4, concerning the ROTC activities at Yale and Dartmouth, was very much to the point. The editorial follows:

## A CHILDISH ATTACK ON THE ROTC

Other professions may or may not be older, but the soldier's profession must inevitably rank at the top of any list if you consider

honor as well as antiquity. It is little short of inconceivable, therefore, that the faculties of two prominent eastern colleges—Yale and Dartmouth—have taken steps to strip military training of its academic standing and to relegate the Reserve Officers Training corps to the status of an extracurricular activity.

The chairman of the Yale faculty committee on the curriculum went so far as to say that "R.O.T.C. is like singing in the Wiffenpoofs—a perfectly fine activity but one that we don't think merits any academic standing."

This is an utterly asinine statement and reflects the childish attitude of those who think they can put an end to war by going about picketing recruiting offices and changing the name of Ho Chi Minh—who, along with Mao Tse-tung is one of the champion exponents of military aggression in the world today. This attitude is wholly unworthy of any professor, let alone the chairman of a faculty committee.

Are we to conclude that in the arrogant opinion of these gentlemen our educational institutions are above such menial and incidental activities as securing the freedom and independence of the United States, or preserving its unity, or defeating the Nazis, or unseating dictators like Napoleon, or, more currently, defending freedom against the manifest designs of the Communists?

How much good would all the liberal arts degrees in the world do if there were not the freedom in which to profess and practice these arts? How would Yale and Dartmouth, with their great reputations for academic freedom, fare in a world which was allowed, by default, to fall under the sway of communism—like Cuba—where there is no truth but the party truth?

We are as eager as anybody to see an end to war; but a glance about the world today should make it quite clear that war is still here and that our security still depends largely on a well trained military force. College R. O. T. C. programs have been of inestimable value in training reserves to supplement the men trained at the military, naval, and air force academies.

By voting to withdraw academic credit from R. O. T. C. courses and to deprive the officers in charge of those courses of their standing as professors, the faculties are yielding to the transient demands of a vociferous minority which is almost sure to forget all about R. O. T. C. as soon as the Viet Nam war is over. The messages on the placards being waved by campus demonstrators are not likely to qualify as eternal verities.

## REFORMING THE WELFARE SYSTEM

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have today cosponsored a bill with the gentlemen from New York (Mr. CAREY and Mr. HALPERN), and a number of my colleagues to begin the urgently needed reform of the Federal welfare system now in use. Our welfare system, as it is now designed, is not working. It satisfies neither those who bear the costs, those who attempt to administer it, or those who are dependent on it for support. This bill is designed to establish national minimum standards of welfare for all States in the Union. It is a first step in the constructive overhaul that is required.

By setting national minimum standards for welfare payments, we will correct a fundamental deficiency in the system as it now stands. Today, there are wide ranges in welfare payments from State to State. The average payment of aid to dependent children in New York State is \$61.70 per month; in Mississippi it is \$8.40. This variation in payments has caused the poor in one State to move to other areas where payments are higher; an understandable desire when we consider the gross inadequacy of a payment of \$8.40 per month for a child.

But, this movement has placed a strain on those States that provide welfare payments in keeping with their social responsibilities. The welfare roles of New York State, Pennsylvania, California, and others have been swollen by the movement of the poor from the South and from rural areas. In New York City this year, the welfare bill is going to increase by \$400 million, to a total of \$1.7 billion. And it is estimated that there will be close to 1 million welfare recipients out of the city's 8 million citizens. This growth is far larger than that which would occur with normal population growth. Part of this migration reflects a genuine desire to improve one's opportunities, to take advantage of better job opportunities in a new location. But there are also cases where welfare recipients are searching for higher levels of welfare payments. This incentive should be removed.

Although the migration of the poor to our urban centers is in the tradition of the search for new frontiers, a homestead, a new opportunity, the conditions of modern industrial society do not favor this migration. The underskilled and undereducated migrant from a rural area finds that he does not have the talents demanded in the urban job market. He is forced to work in the marginal areas of the employment market where wages are low—too low to keep him and his family alive in a high cost of living area—and where unemployment first makes itself felt. It is no surprise, then, that this migrant winds up on the welfare roles.

The bill that I have cosponsored revises the welfare system to halt this migration. By providing a national minimum standard of welfare, welfare payments will be removed as an artificial inducement to move. This revision has been recommended by the Advisory Council on Public Welfare, President Nixon's task force on public assistance, and has been endorsed in principle by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Finch.

Going beyond the corrections contained in this legislation however, minor revisions of our welfare system will not be enough. The concept of welfare as we now know it is not acceptable. It is not acceptable because it has created within our society a group of citizens who grow up totally dependent on welfare payments for existence. The young girl whose mother is on welfare grows up knowing no other pattern of life other than having children and collecting welfare checks. The system is designed to break up homes. The young boy grows up without a man in the house; he has no

E 964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks February 7, 1969

father who goes to work each day, who can establish a pattern of living which the young boy can emulate.

The system is also unacceptable because it places burdens on other wage earners that are not necessary. If a system can be devised that allows the father or mother to earn as much as they can and still receive public funds that will allow them to maintain a minimum standard of living, welfare costs may be reduced and the cycle of welfare dependency that the present system creates may be broken by reestablishing the family unit.

I am exploring the concepts of negative income tax, family payments, extension of the minimum wage laws to end the situation where an employee works a full week but still doesn't earn enough to support his family. We will need to continue payments to the sick, the aged, the orphaned and others obviously in need. But we must find a better way to prevent the growth of what Gunnar Myrdal has called an "underclass," an undereducated, underemployed group of citizens dependent on welfare for their existence. Our society can do better, it must.

## NATIONAL BOY SCOUT WEEK

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the week of February 7-13, 1969, is of special significance to the millions of American boys and adults who are affiliated with the Boy Scouts of America. It is Boy Scout Week, the annual commemoration of the founding of the movement in our country, and the 53d anniversary of the chartering of the Boy Scouts of America by Congress.

In every one of the 50 States, young men from 8 to 18 are celebrating Boy Scout Week with displays and special events in their communities, directing attention to the training and skills developed through one of the free world's greatest youth movements. Under the guidance of their able leaders, these young men are showing and telling the American people about the contributions Scouting is making to the future of our country.

During observances of the 50th anniversary of the chartering of the Boy Scouts by Congress, I had the pleasure of preparing a survey of the 89th Congress to determine the influence of Scouting on its Members. I was asked by the Boy Scouts of America to update the survey for the 90th Congress and again for the 91st. I am pleased to report the results of the most recent survey which reveal that 335, or over 60 percent, of the Members of Congress have participated in the Scouting program either as Scouts or as adult volunteer leaders. And although the 11 women Members of Congress have not been counted in the statistics as eligible to participate in Scouting, one has served as a Cub Scout den mother and another has been named an "Honorary Boy Scout."

The Eagle Award, which is the highest rank that can be attained by a Scout, was earned by 28 of the 280 Members who were Scouts. Of the 148 who served in an adult volunteer capacity, eight have been presented the Silver Beaver Award, given for outstanding volunteer service at the local council level. One Member has earned the coveted Silver Buffalo Award for contributions at the national level, and two others have been awarded the Silver Antelope for outstanding service to one of the 12 Scout regions.

Mr. Speaker, that such a large proportion of the Members of Congress have come under the influence of the Scouting program, subscribing to an oath pledging "Duty to God and Country" speaks well not only of Scouting and this Congress, but of the foresight displayed by our predecessors 53 years ago when they granted a charter to the Boy Scouts of America.

Under unanimous consent I make the results of my survey part of the RECORD in observance of National Boy Scout Week, February 7 through 13, 1969.

## TAX REFORM

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have this week cosponsored legislation to double personal income tax exemptions from the present \$600 to \$1,200 per dependent.

This is a long-overdue change which would directly aid the great mass of our Nation's taxpayers—the low- and middle-income worker and the younger people who are struggling to raise families in the face of a constantly increasing cost of living.

The \$600 exemption has been unchanged for 21 years. During that period, the cost of every basic item has risen sharply. Food has nearly doubled, rent and clothing have more than doubled, medical costs have gone up over 90 percent.

It is unrealistic to maintain that today \$600 will even come close to the cost of raising a child or caring for an aging or dependent parent.

This legislation represents a second step in the desperately needed overhaul of our income tax laws. Last week, I cosponsored a bill calling for a 13-point tax reform program, aimed primarily at closing the loopholes which enable large corporations and wealthy persons to avoid paying a fair share of the tax burden.

I was pleased to note in the press this week that the Nixon administration apparently supports the bulk of these overdue tax reforms. Perhaps enough of my Republican colleagues will join with Democrats who have long sought this goal, and we will finally be able to achieve meaningful tax revisions.

A most excellent third step in this direction would be the adoption of legislation to establish a minimum tax for individuals and corporations.

posals were made in the 89th Congress by the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, but it was pigeonholed in committee. I supported the idea then, and I think today it is only fair to let such a minimum tax. I was pleased to see that in his press conference of this week President Nixon has endorsed the principle of a minimum tax for all taxpayers. This type of tax would move toward correction of the unbelievable situation of 155 Americans with adjusted gross incomes of over \$200,000 paying no income tax at all in 1967. Too many wealthy people and big corporations today either pay no tax at all, or pay a ridiculously low amount, because of loopholes and gimmicks in the Internal Revenue Code.

As I told the House last week, the demand for tax reform has grown so loud that the Congress dare ignore it no longer.

## DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, while peace is a major concern of every thoughtful American, our country, lacking direction, has often failed to convert its peacekeeping desires into a peacekeeping reality.

I, therefore, rise today in support of legislation to redirect this Nation's energies toward a lasting peace. Yesterday, together with many of my colleagues, I introduced legislation for the establishment of a Department of Peace and World Order. While no panacea, this new Government function, if adopted, will be given a mandate to discover nonviolent means of resolving the inevitable international conflicts that arise between other nations and our own.

Mr. Speaker, the search for peace within our time has been hampered by some who hold that war is an inevitable product of "human nature". I say this view is false.

As every student of history knows, at various times during the past 7,000 years of human experience, large and complex populations inhabiting vast areas of settlement have lived in peace through many generations.

The world today, however, is at latest count divided into at least 140 sovereign states, each vying for existence. The idea of politically merging each of these separate powers into a single, peaceful world government is just not realistically possible. Compounding the difficulty is the grim threat of nuclear or bacteriological extinction.

The simple truth is, civilized man must place an urgent new priority upon peace. In the free world, and within the United States especially, a new balance must be struck between our spectacular technological advances versus the relatively primitive state of the social and political sciences.

Sanity and survival demand that we divert toward peace at least a portion of the organized, massive resources now committed to the machinery of war. We must begin to look for ways to achieve ra-

February 7, 1969

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 965

tional, nonviolent means rather than through ever more sophisticated instruments of death.

It is in this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I join my colleagues in the House in our plea for support of this new legislation to create a Department of Peace.

For the record, let me point to the long precedent for action such as we are proposing. Between the 84th and 90th Congresses, 1955-68, no less than 85 bills were introduced into the House or Senate to create a Department of Peace. In fact, from Revolutionary times forward, various American groups have advanced a similar idea that a Secretary of Peace, at Cabinet level, be created to balance the Secretary of Defense—formerly the Secretary of War.

Despite this long tradition, never have any of these measures been moved from committee or voted upon within the Congress of the United States. Moreover, if reports are correct concerning President Nixon's reaction to this legislation, a vote upon this proposal will be difficult to obtain.

With all due respect to the wisdom of the executive branch, Mr. Speaker, I must maintain that neither the Department of Defense nor the Department of State are charged with the responsibility of using vast resources for researching ways to achieve the peace.

John Foster Dulles, in 1957, indicated that in his view the function of the Department of State is neither to foster peace nor prevent war, but to promote the "national interest." Certainly we cannot maintain that all of the planes, tanks, bombs, and assorted other vehicles of the Department of Defense have brought us any closer to the illusive peace we seek, for it is that agency's responsibility to defend our country at all costs. However, to saddle them with an equally important responsibility would be to dilute both.

And so, in summary, I urge my colleagues to work toward the success of this measure. Peacemaking should be our country's full-time concern. Achievement of this goal would be among the most important enactments of the 91st Congress.

## SEX AND SUBVERSION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, little children are denied prayer in school, and in many instances forbidden to salute our flag or repeat the Pledge of Allegiance. Yet, parents are being persuaded to accept as a matter of academic truth that their children can be protected from future psychological disorder by a full exposure in their early years to the mysteries of sex.

Furthermore we find creeping into their textbooks indoctrination in violence. Any rational individual examining the deterioration of the classroom textbooks can but conclude that the promoters of such programs are either dangerously

sick or are undertaking subversive efforts to destroy the moral fiber of America's future by warping the minds of our youth.

In practice, sensitivity training—or self-criticism—has been used by Communist leadership to reduce the dignity of man in their enslaved countries to subhuman status for pacification and easy control of the masses. Many examples of collective manipulation to maintain power thusly are presently in operation. As recently as Wednesday, January 22, 1969, the Washington Post carried a report from Hong Kong describing the reindoctrination of Teng Hsiao-ping to replace dictator Mao Tse-tung. The article described reports from Peking that Teng has been attending Red confessional meetings to absolve himself of his supposed sins. The report continued:

## SEEN AT CONFESSIONAL

Though his return to prominence has not been officially announced, reliable reports reaching here from Peking say that Teng has lately been attending confessional meetings in the Chinese capital in order to absolve himself of his supposed sins.

This practice of "self-criticism" is standard Chinese Communist procedure designed to permit alleged deviationists to correct their errors.

The mothers and fathers of American youth are already incensed at the indecencies and violence purveyed to their children through the television, movies, and even the radio. But the mental manipulators through their ratings and polls have been made aware that mother and dad are turning off television and staying away from the movies to shield their children.

So it became necessary to reach the minds of the children that they launch a new attack—via the classroom and the textbook.

Today we find the classrooms of America have been turned into a battleground to subvert the minds of our youth.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a paper by Gary Allen entitled, "Sex Study" from the March, 1969, American Opinion, and releases from the National Enquirer for January 26, and the Washington Post for January 22, 1969, following my remarks:

[From American Opinion, March 1969]

## SEX STUDY: PROBLEMS, PROPAGANDA, AND PORNOGRAPHY

(NOTE.—Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of Communist Revolution In The Streets—a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to American Opinion. Mr. Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.)

Sex education in the schools is not new. Most high schools have for years conducted courses which teach the biological facts of life. What is new is that these are now sneered at by sex educationists as "plumbing courses," inadequate for "modern social needs." What is needed, we are told, is a jet-age "sex education" which really gets down to the nitty gritty.

And that is just what we are getting. As the Saturday Evening Post related before its recent demise, the "sex-education"

programs which are now "mushrooming all over the country are newer than the new math. . . . America seems to have suddenly discovered an urgent need for universal sex education—from kindergarten through high school, some enthusiasts insist—and is galloping off in all directions at once to meet it." The Post trumpeted that fifty percent of public and parochial schools are now providing the glories of academic sexuality, and that at the present rate the figure will pass seventy percent within a year.

Nothing happens in a vacuum, and the educationists' sex explosion would not be taking place unless a great deal of influence, organization, and money were being poured into its promotion from somewhere. It is. The organization behind the new "sex education" now sweeping the nation is S.I.E.C.U.S., Sex Information and Education Council of the United States. (Pronounced, seek us.) As the Post noted, "Among the organizations shaping the structure of American sex education, by far the most influential is S.I.E.C.U.S." McCall's puts it this way: "Today's atmosphere in sex education cannot be described without mention of a high-voltage, nonprofit organization called S.I.E.C.U.S., which is without doubt the single most important force in sparking sex education in our schools. . . ." The Wall Street Journal records that "S.I.E.C.U.S. reports fifty to seventy inquiries a week from schools, churches, and other organizations seeking guidance on sex education."

A leaflet distributed by the National Education Association describes S.I.E.C.U.S. as a voluntary health agency founded in New York City, in 1964, to provide "assistance to communities and schools wishing to embark on sex education programs. S.I.E.C.U.S. will act as a clearinghouse for research and education in sex, as a source of information about sex education in the schools, and as a public forum where consideration of various aspects of man's sexuality can be carried out in dignified and objective fashion."

The tax-free S.I.E.C.U.S. organization operates largely from foundation grants—which means that American taxpayers are ultimately footing the bill. Those who write to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare concerning "sex education" are now advised to contact S.I.E.C.U.S. The Department of H.E.W. is also putting your money where its commitment is, and in 1967 granted \$1.5 million to support the new "sex education" programs in thirteen school districts. In addition, officers of the U.S. Office of Education have served, or are serving, on the Board of Directors of S.I.E.C.U.S.

Chief torchbearer for S.I.E.C.U.S. is Dr. Mary Calderone, the organization's Executive Director—referred by McCall's as the Commander-in-Chief of "sex education" forces. Since the Commander-in-Chief's attitudes must of necessity be reflected in the choice of materials for the S.I.E.C.U.S. program we are all required to subsidize, her views have undergone close scrutiny by concerned parents. Dr. Calderone has, for example, often made clear her commitment to the "New Morality"—as old as Sodom and Gomorrah. In speaking to 320 boys at Blair Academy in New Jersey, S.I.E.C.U.S. Director Calderone commented: "What is sex for? It's for fun . . . for wonderful sensation. . . . Sex is not something you turn off like a faucet. If you do, it's unhealthy." And, she continued: "We need new values to establish when and how we should have sexual experiences."

What sort of "new values"?

According to Look magazine, when a student asked: "What is your opinion of premarital sex relations among teenagers?" Mrs. Calderone snapped back: "What's yours? Nobody from on high [God] determines this. You determine it. . . . I don't believe . . . the old 'Thou Shalt Not's' apply anymore." She certainly doesn't.



E 966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks February 7, 1969

In Seventeen magazine, the S.I.E.C.U.S. Executive Director claimed "sex is not the prerogative of Christianity," and the Saturday Evening Post quotes her as declaring that sexual "do's and don'ts" cannot be imposed on the young. After telling her youthful audiences that "there doesn't seem to be any correlation between premarital sex and success in marriage," she regularly leaves the decision of premarital intercourse up to the glands of her young listeners. The Boston Globe of December 5, 1968, quotes her as telling a blushing audience of five hundred high school boys and girls:

"The question goes far beyond 'Will I go to bed?' and it's one you must answer for yourselves. You boys may know a girl is physically ready, but you have to ask yourselves: 'Am I ready to take the responsibility to say, yes, she is ready emotionally and psychologically?'"

Though described by Post as a Joan of Arc for "sex education," Dr. Calderone is more often referred to as "a sweet-faced, silvery-haired grandmother" who shocks audiences by using four-letter words to make her point. Her motto is "tell them everything and tell them early." According to the Saturday Evening Post,

"Contrary to the views of most child psychoanalysts, Dr. Calderone holds that sex education should start in the nursery. Around the age of three the child should assimilate such knowledge, along with the correct terminology such as 'The penis of the father is made to carry the sperm into the mother through the vagina.' Kindergarten teachers should then impart additional clinical details."

That's right, kindergarten teachers!

As you might expect, the S.I.E.C.U.S. Executive Director also has very progressive ideas concerning homosexuality. As she is fond of telling youngsters: "Almost everybody has some attraction to people of the same sex. . . . I cannot condemn it." Every boy in an urban environment, she says, "is going to have a homosexual advance made to him, and therefore he should understand what it is and what his attitude about it and about himself should be."

And what should that attitude be? Concerning homosexuals, the S.I.E.C.U.S. Commander-in-Chief smirks to boys in her lectures: ". . . you owe that person your responsibility and understanding, even if you don't share his conviction." Dr. Calderone adds, sadly, that "it will be some time before homosexuality receives general acceptance." Unless, of course, her "educational" efforts on behalf of S.I.E.C.U.S. are successful.

If Dr. Mary Calderone is the Joan of Arc of the school-sex revolution, Dr. Lester Kirkendall, Professor of Family Life at Oregon State University, and a member of the S.I.E.C.U.S. Board of Directors, is its Pied Piper. Dr. Kirkendall, a prolific author of sex books and magazine articles about every conceivable sexual foible, will never be accused of being an old fuddy-duddy by even the hippest of the pornopoliticians. Still, Kirkendall is referred to by *Reader's Digest* as "without question, one of the most respected authorities in the whole field of sex education and family life." He has a according to the *Digest*, "helped to create today's new generation of sex educators."

Lester Kirkendall says he believes that "if present trends continue, premarital intercourse will almost certainly increase." But, the Professor adds, he doesn't feel this is necessarily bad. He writes in *Sex And Our Society* that if couples "do experiment with sex only to have their relationship founder, their honest efforts to understand and be responsible to one another may well have been more gain than loss."

Like Mrs. Calderone, S.I.E.C.U.S. director Kirkendall is not "hungup" with the religious and moral foundations of sex. He is, in fact, a past director of the anti-religious

American Humanist Association, and has written in its magazine that morality cannot be found in the context of "supernaturalism or a supernatural deity." Instead, he defines his religion as a "respect for and a belief in people, and a concern for true brotherhood among men." Just as Kirkendall rejects God for "people," he also rejects patriotism, actually going so far as to brand defense of one's country as immoral. In "Searching for the Roots of Moral Decisions," he writes:

*A tremendous feeling of national unity, a sense of closeness, good will, and harmony may result from fearing another nation or from the effort of trying to destroy another nation. Such unity . . . is immoral.*

Another founder of S.I.E.C.U.S.—and its longtime Treasurer—is Isadore Rubin. He too shares Dr. Kirkendall's rejection of patriotism. Rubin was on May 3, 1965 identified in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a member of the Communist Party by Mrs. Mildred Blauvelt, an undercover operative within the Communist Party for the New York Police Department. Rubin was subsequently Editor of the New York Teacher News, published by the New York Teachers Union—which was expelled from the A.F.L.-C.I.O. when it was found to be controlled by the Communists. So total was his commitment to the Reds that he even had to be dismissed from his job as a teacher in New York City because of his refusal to deny his membership in the Communist Party.

In addition to his subversive work for S.I.E.C.U.S., Comrade Rubin now edits the notorious Sexology magazine. Although S.I.E.C.U.S. proclaims that one of its purposes is to counter exploitation of sex, its own officers are involved in the wildest sort of sex exploitation. Rubin's pulpy Sexology magazine dwells on sex sensationalism, with lurid pictures of men and women in the most intimate positions, presenting trash articles dealing with the worst sort of perversion. Examples of features in recent issues include: "Can Humans Breed With Animals?" and "Witchcraft And Sex—1968," and "The First Sadists," and "Wife Swapping In Naples," and "My Double Sex Life (the story of a bisexual)," and "Gangs That Hunt Down Queers," and "Why I Like Homosexual Men," and "Unusual Sex Demands," ad nauseam. In addition, Sexology also features film reviews of the latest "adult movies," carries advertisements for rank sex books, and has published its own titillating work on Transvestism.

Mr. Rubin's Sexology periodical has for years been available at certain seedy stores around the country (often from behind the counter, with the pages stapled together), but bigger and better things are in store for the magazine. Speaking in December of 1968 to a group of educators at an institute on "sex education" sponsored by the International Business Machines Corporation, S.I.E.C.U.S.'s Lester Kirkendall revealed that Sexology is currently being revised with a different cover and titles so it can be used in the schools.<sup>1</sup>

Now, get this: Dr. Lester Kirkendall serves with Communist Isadore Rubin as an Editor of Sexology magazine. Also on the staff of this pornographic sheet are S.I.E.C.U.S. directors William Genné, John Money, and Wardell Pomeroy.

Another of those laboring with Communist

<sup>1</sup> Kirkendall, according to the Anaheim Bulletin of December 19, 1968, ridiculed those at the I.B.M.-sponsored sex institute who noted that Isadore Rubin was identified as a Communist before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. "Rubin," said Kirkendall, "only wrote a paper for the Daily Worker." The sworn testimony of the New York detective who was in the same Red cell as Comrade Rubin contradicts Dr. Kirkendall's claim.

Isadore Rubin and his fellow pornographers on the Board of Directors of S.I.E.C.U.S. is Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz, the newly elected President of the million-member National Education Association.<sup>2</sup> The radically Leftist Mrs. Koontz urges teachers to ". . . organize, agitate, and strike." In paraphrasing the Communist Black Panthers to call for "Teacher Power," she explains: "We cannot teach democracy and ignore what is wrong. . . ." It is thus not surprising that N.E.A. has been in the forefront of promoting S.I.E.C.U.S. throughout the nation, and that Mary Calderone has been a contributor to the N.E.A. Journal.

Earlier we mentioned Sexology staffer William Genné—a director, founder, and officer of S.I.E.C.U.S. who calls himself "Reverend" and is Director of the Commission on Marriage and Family Life of the National Council of Churches. The "Reverend" Genné, who offers the view that those who think "Wherever healing takes place, Christ is present, no matter what the Church says about fornication," has quite a background himself. In addition to his consultation in pornography at Sexology, the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities record that Genné has affiliated himself with such Communist Fronts as the Stockholm Peace Petition, the World Peace Appeal, the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act, the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, etc.

Then there is S.I.E.C.U.S. director William Masters, who published with Virginia E. Johnson the best-selling *Human Sexual Response*. That incredible volume records Dr. Masters' studies in intercourse and auto-manipulation of 694 persons. Masters had no qualms about employing unmarried subjects to perform before the cameras for this subsequently popularized study of intercourse, and used an artificial plastic phallus which recorded female responses. The S.I.E.C.U.S. director was quoted in *Playboy*<sup>4</sup> (May, 1968) describing the tortuous device as follows:

"The equipment can be adjusted for physical variations in size, weight and vaginal development. The rate and depth of penile thrust is initiated and controlled completely by the responding individual."

The immediate past-President of S.I.E.C.U.S. is sociologist David Mace, who stated his case for the "New Morality" in the April, 1968, issue of *Sexology* as follows:

"The simple fact is that through most of our history in Western Christendom we have based our standards of sexual behavior on premises that are now totally insupportable—on the folklore of the ancient Hebrews and on the musings of medieval monks, concepts that are simply obsolete."

The current President of S.I.E.C.U.S. is Lester Doniger, said to be the former Publisher of *Pulpit Digest*, Director of Pulpit Book Club, and President of the Pulpit Press. Curiously, Doniger's autobiographical note in *Who's Who In World Jewry* does not mention his Protestant publishing business, and he has variously listed his birthplace as Raczk, Poland, and Vienna, Austria. We do know that the *Great Neck* [New York] *News* of February 14, 1967, carried an article entitled "US-USSR Committee Announces Meeting," which reported that a forum would

<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Koontz has just been named by President Nixon to head the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

<sup>3</sup> S.I.E.C.U.S. director Calderone is also a member of that N.C.C. Commission.

<sup>4</sup> Listed as sponsors of S.I.E.C.U.S.'s second annual dinner were the notorious Hugh Hefner of *Playboy*, John Cowles of *Look*, Secretary of State and Mrs. Robert Strange McNamara, Leftist Stewart Mott (heir to a G.M. fortune), best-selling author Vance Packard, Steven Rockefeller, and James Warburg of the International banking family.